

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 7-20 were pending prior to the Final Office Action. Claims 21-24 are added. Therefore, claims 7-22 are pending upon entry of the amendments. Claims 7 and 10 are independent.

Scope Not Altered

Claims 14 and 18 are amended merely to address informal issues. The scope of the claims are not narrowed by the Amendment.

§ 112, 1st Paragraph Rejection

Claims 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleges that the claims contain subject matter which is not described in the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 14 recites, in part "wherein the numerical characters of the file names of the image files are consecutively numbered regardless even when image files from a plurality of first loadable and removable recording mediums are read out and recorded on the second loadable and removable recording medium." In other words, the image files are consecutively numbered in the second loadable and removable recording medium when the image files are

read from the first medium. For example, as illustrated in Figure 2 of the present application, and related descriptions thereof, it is clear that the image files in the second medium 23 are consecutively numbered. As illustrated, files DSC00001 to DSC00100 are contributed from the memory card 1 and the image files DSC00101 to DSC00104 are contributed from the memory card 2. In the second medium 23, all image files are consecutively numbered. Clearly, claim 14 is supported by the specification as originally presented.

Claim 18 recites, in part "wherein the numerical characters of the file names of the image files are consecutively numbered regardless even when image files from a plurality of first loadable and removable recording medium are read-out and recorded on the second loadable and removable recording medium." As demonstrated above, claim 18 is supported by the specification as originally submitted.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 14 and 18 be withdrawn.

§ 103 Rejection – Shiota

Claims 7-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Shiota et al. (EP 0 838 767 A2). (Shiota is the first named inventor of the cited reference) Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 7 recites, in part "a file-number read-out device for reading out a last-number of file-numbers for image files that have been

recorded on the second loadable and removable recording medium." In previous replies, Applicant amply demonstrated that at best, Shiota merely discloses keeping a count - i.e., a reception number - of the memory cards loaded into the system. Thus, the counter merely identifies the memory card. The Examiner alleges that the memory card is equivalent to the first loadable and removable recording medium as recited. Thus, even under the Examiner's interpretation, Shiota merely discloses keeping track of an identity of the first recording medium. Shiota does not teach or suggest the feature of reading-out the last file number of the image files that are recorded on the second loadable and recording medium. This is sufficient to distinguish claim 7 from Shiota.

Also, independent claim 7 recites, in part "changing a file name of the image file that has been read-out of the first loadable and removable recording medium ... and recording the read image file on the second loadable and removable recording medium." In the Final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the laboratory system as disclosed in column 7, lines 18-35 of Shiota implies a second recording medium. Applicant does not necessarily agree.

Regardless, claim 7 clearly recites that the second recording medium is loadable and removable. There is no indication, and indeed the Examiner did not even allege, that Shiota discloses a loadable recording medium as the second recording medium. Indeed, observation of Figure 1 of Shiota, and more specifically, the laboratory system 4 as illustrated in Figure 1, does not even contemplate a loadable recording medium. Therefore, Shiota does not teach or

suggest, and indeed teaches away from, the feature of the second loadable and removable recording medium. Clearly, independent claim 7 is distinguishable over Shiota.

Independent claim 10 recites, in part "reading-out a last file-number of file-numbers for image files that have been recorded on the second loadable and removable recording medium" and "changing a file name of the image file that has been read-out of the first loadable and removable recording medium to the incremented file-number and recording the read image file on the second loadable and removable recording medium." As demonstrated above, claim 10 is distinguishable over Shiota.

Claims 8-9 and 11-20 depend from independent claims 7 and 10 directly or indirectly. Therefore, for at least due to the dependency thereon, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over Shiota.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7-20 based on Shiota be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 21-24 are added through this Reply. All new claims depend from independent claims 7 and 10 directly or indirectly. For at least due to the dependency thereon, the new claims are allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that the new claims be allowed.


Conclusion

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: **MARCH 6, 2006**

Respectfully submitted,

By  #39,491
e D. Richard Anderson
Registration No.: 40,439
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

HMS